

Y-W



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,664	11/21/2003	Pierre Coldefy	245517US41X CONT	9054
22850	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			RAHMJOO, MANUCHER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,664

Applicant(s)

COLDEFY ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Rahmjoo

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/21/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1 line 7 recites "...in the at least one window the airport...". It is not clear what the applicant is claiming. Is it "the at least one window" displaying the "airport" or displaying the "scaled airport".

Claim 10 has similar rejection.

Claims 2- 9 and 11- 18 are indefinite because they depend on indefinite antecedent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1- 3, 7- 12 and 16- 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vandevoorde et al (US patent 6,246,342), hereinafter, Vandevoorde.

As per claims 1 and 10 Vandevoorde teaches a display including at least one window see for example figure 7 window 39 ; a database (MMI) including data related to an airport see for example column 8 lines 19- 20; a selector (see for example figure 7 window 40) configured to select a degree of zoom for the airport to be displayed from a plurality of different degrees of zoom see for example column 7 lines 25- 37 and figures 6- 7; a control unit (see for example the system of figure 7 wherein a mouse is used for clicking on various work functions) connected to the display, the database and the selector and configured to control the display to display in the at least one window the airport according to a scale value representative of the degree of zoom (see for example the size in the pull down menu or the plus GUI in the work functions area above window 39 of figure 7) selected by the selector see for example figure 7; and a changing unit configured to change the scale value representative of the degree of zoom see for example column 7 lines 51- 52 for the control windows that allow touch

control and lines 60- 67 for the zooming to control the individual lights and the corresponding enlargement and also the plus and size GUI of figure 7.

As per claims 2 and 11 Vandevoorde inherently teaches the selector includes a least one zoom button configured to zoom in and zoom out between a maximum zoom value and a minimum zoom value so as to display different detailed views of the airport see for example figure 7 for the zooming to maximum and minimum through the plus and size GUI.

As per claims 3 and 12 and as to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, Vandevoorde teaches the selector includes: a first button (plus and size GUI of figure 7) configured to display the airport in the window according to a first predefined zoom degree corresponding to general navigation including a full display of the airport see for example figures 1, 7, and 9- 10 ; a second button configured to display the airport in the window according to a second predefined zoom degree corresponding to proximity navigation including a plurality of details of the airport see for example column 7 lines 38- 49 for the zoom display of an aircraft position and the movement of the aircraft (proximity navigation) along with airport specific data and see also figure 4; and a third button configured to display the airport in the window according to a third predefined zoom degree corresponding to airport details required for precision taxiing see for example column 8 lines 24- 30 for the enlargement of the screen for safe taxiing.

As per claims 7 and 16 Vandevoorde teaches the selector includes a selection mechanism configured to select a portion of the airport such that the portion of the airport is displayed in the window see for example figures 12- 14.

As per claims 8 and 17 Vandevoorde teaches the selector includes a displacement button configured to displace a view of the airport being displayed on the window in horizontal and vertical directions so as to display other portions of the airport see for example column 4 lines 60- 67.

As per claims 9 and 18 Vandevoorde teaches the control unit is configured to display two different degrees of zoom in a continuous manner such that a change from the first degree of zoom to the second degree of zoom appears continuous to an operator viewing the display see for example figures 7 and 12- 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4- 6 and 13- 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandevoorde in view of Takishita (US Patent 6,121,900).

As per claims 4 and 13 Vandevoorde does not teach the display system is installed in a moving vehicle, and wherein the selector includes a centering button configured to automatically reconfigure the display such that the moving vehicle is displayed in a center of the window.

However, Takishita teaches the display system is installed in a moving vehicle, and wherein the selector includes a centering button configured to automatically

Art Unit: 2676

reconfigure the display such that the moving vehicle is displayed in a center of the window see for example column 2 lines 35- 40 wherein the vehicle position CM is in the center of the screen.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Takishita into Vandevorode to help the driver of the vehicle recognize the vehicle position and therefore give the driver of a vehicle route guide information whereby the driver can easily arrive at a desired destination and throughout the navigation see for example column 1 lines 10- 20.

As per claims 5 and 14 Takishita teaches the selector includes a selection mechanism configured to display predefined portions in a cyclic manner based on selections of the selection mechanism see for example figure 2 wherein the vehicle is shown traveling on the road (predefined path) in the direction of 1- 4(cyclic manner).

As per claims 6 and 15 Takishita teaches a toggle button configured to automatically display the entire airport on the window upon selection of the toggle button and to redisplay a portion of the airport being displayed prior to selection of the toggle button upon another selection of the toggle button see for example figure 6 and column 4 lines 25- 37 for the remote control unit with element 15f as the operation screen selection key to select a screen to expand/ reduce thereby show the entire road and the detailed road (portion displayed).

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is (703) 305-5658. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30- 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (703) 308- 6829. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872- 9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Mike Rahmjoo

February 2, 2005



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600